

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-37 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 13-14, 20, 25, 29, and 33-34 are amended to more clearly define the invention and claim 2 is canceled. Claims 1, 13, 20, 25, and 33 are independent.

These amendments are made only to more particularly point out the invention for the Examiner and not for narrowing the scope of the claims or for any reason related to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Applicants also note that, notwithstanding any claim amendments herein or later during prosecution, Applicants' intent is to encompass equivalents of all claim elements.

Claims 1-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(3) as being anticipated by the Burke et al. reference.

This rejection is respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

An exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention, as recited by, for example, independent claim 1, is directed to a method of discovering a business object definition that includes receiving an object and a collaboration code, and determining a business object definition for the object based upon the collaboration code.

Conventional systems and methods may include object discovery agents that produce business object definitions that including mapping information between object attributes and data fields in the application data sources. However, these methods and systems must subscribe in advance to the pre-defined business object definitions, and can only exchange business objects of the business object definitions. Changes in business object definitions often render these conventional systems and methods useless. Further, these systems and methods often need to subscribe to a very large number of business object definitions.

In stark contrast, the present invention is capable of determining a business object definition for an object based upon a collaboration code. In this manner, the present invention is capable of reverse engineering the composition of a business object thereby obviating the above-described problems.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH REJECTION

The Office Action alleges that claim 1 is not enabled by the specification. In particular, the Office Action alleges that the specification provides support for the discovery of a business object definition, but not the discovery of an object definition. This amendment amends claim 1 in accordance with Examiner Johnson's very helpful suggestion. Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

III. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTION

The Examiner alleges that claims 1, 13, and 33 are indefinite. While Applicant submits that such would be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow them to know the metes and bounds of the invention, taking the present Application as a whole, to speed prosecution claims 1, 13, and 33 have been amended in accordance with Examiner Johnson's very helpful suggestions.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

IV. THE 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner alleges that claims 1, 7-9, 11, 13-20, 25, and 33 are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In particular, the Examiner alleges that claims 1-2, 5, and 33 fail to produce any useful, concrete and tangible results. In this regard, this Amendment amends claims 1 and 33 in accordance with Examiner Johnson's very helpful suggestions.

The Office action also alleges that claims 7-9, 11, and 13-20 are directed to "software per se."

With respect to claims 7-9 and 11, these claims are method claims which depend from independent claim 1. Independent claim 1 is a method claim. Method claims are not required to recite "hardware in the body" as alleged by the Examiner. Claims 1, 7-9, and 11 are clearly not directed to "software per se."

With respect to claims 13-20, these claims are system claims and are also clearly not directed to "software per se." The claims are not required to be directed to any computer-readable medium and it is improper for the Examiner to attempt to require the claims to be amended to be directed to computer-readable medium. These claims are also clearly not directed to "software per se."

V. THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

The Examiner alleges that the Burke et al. reference teaches the claimed invention. Applicants submit, however, that there are elements of the claimed invention which are neither taught nor suggested by the Burke et al. reference.

The Burke et al. reference does not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention including receiving a collaboration code and determining a business object definition based upon the collaboration code (claims 1, 13, 20, and 33); and receiving and storing a collaboration code and an input object definition (claim 25). As explained above, these features are important for reverse engineering the composition of a business object thereby obviating the above-described problems associated with conventional methods and systems.

In stark contrast, the Burke et al. reference discloses a system and method that relies upon a dynamic business object definition system that includes merging of business object definitions, or combining user-defined business object definitions. The Burke et al. reference does not reverse engineer any business object definitions at all. Rather, the systems and methods disclosed by the Burke et al. reference merely a create business object definitions by simple attribute-by-attribute creation from a business object that does not involve any reversing of business logic to create such business object definitions. The Burke et al. reference merely discloses dynamically creating business object definitions, but only through merging known or existing business object definitions.

Clearly, the Burke et al. reference does not teach or suggest any collaboration code at all. Rather, the Burke et al. reference merely mentions an integration framework for business object definitions. Therefore, the Burke et al. reference does not do any reverse engineering of any business logic at all, let alone determine a business object definition from a collaboration code as

claimed.

Therefore, the Burke et al. reference does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection of claims 1 and 3-37.

VI. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

The Examiner objects to claims 1 and 33. While Applicant submits that such would be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow them to know the metes and bounds of the invention, taking the present Application as a whole, to speed prosecution claims 1 and 33 have been amended in accordance with Examiner Johnson's very helpful suggestions. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 3-37, all the claims presently pending in the Application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the Application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Assignee's Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully Submitted,



James E. Howard
Registration No. 39,715

Date: May 16, 2007

McGinn Intellectual Property Law Group, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Rd., Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 48150